

**REMARKS**

Claims 1 and 3-20 are currently pending in the subject application, and are presently under consideration. Claim 1 has been amended to correct minor informalities. The amendment to claim 1 is not intended to limit claim 1 in any manner. Claims 1 and 3-20 are rejected. Favorable reconsideration of the application is requested in view of the comments herein.

**I. Rejection of Claims 1 and 3-20 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 1 and 3-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2003/0005291 to Burn ("Burn") and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,490,367 to Carlsson, et al. ("Carlsson"). Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites a token issuance and binding process comprising providing a plurality of tokens, each token having a unique ID number stored therein and generating a unique public/private key pair for each token. Claim 1 also recites storing each token ID number and corresponding public key in a directory/database and storing each private key in its respective token. Claim 1 further recites binding a unique ID number of a user to a corresponding one the plurality of tokens by storing the correspondence there between in the directory/database. Claim 1 still further recites reviewing, by a Tokenizing Officer, credentials of the user and forwarding the user ID number and the token ID number to a certificate management system (CMS) along with an electronic form request and a signature of the Tokenizing Officer, wherein the Tokenizing Officer comprises a person.

The Examiner contends that Burn in view of Carlsson makes claim 1 obvious. Applicant's representative respectfully disagrees. In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner admits that the Burn does not teach or suggest reviewing, by a Tokenizing Officer, credentials of the user and forwarding the user ID number and the token ID number to a CMS along with an electronic form request and a signature of the Tokenizing Officer, wherein the Tokenizing Officer comprises a person, as recited in claim 1. However, the Examiner contends that Carlsson makes up for the deficiencies of Burn. Specifically, the Examiner contends that the certificate issuing

process disclosed in Carlsson reads on the reviewing and forwarding performed by the Tokenizing Officer recited in claim 1 (See Office Action, Page 3, citing Col. 8, Lines 12-51 of Carlsson). Applicant's representative respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's contention. Carlsson discloses that an administrator uses a certificate authority (CA) terminal to complete a form with user information and validity periods which are required in order to create a certificate (See Carlsson, Col. 8, Lines 27-30). Carlsson also discloses that a card can be personalized, and that card personalization involves adding a certificate and a user's private key to the card. However, Carlsson does not teach or suggest a Tokenizing Officer forwarding a user ID number and a token ID number to a CMS, as recited in claim 1. In fact, nothing in Carlsson discloses that the cards even contain a token ID number, or some other kind of unique identifier. Accordingly, taken individually or in combination, Burn and Carlsson fail to teach or suggest reviewing, by a Tokenizing Officer, credentials of the user and forwarding the user ID number and the token ID number to a CMS system along with an electronic form request and a signature of the Tokenizing Officer, wherein the Tokenizing Officer comprises a person, as recited in claim 1. Thus, Burn taken in view of Carlsson does not teach or suggest each and every element of claim 1. Therefore, Burn taken in view of Carlsson does not make claim 1 obvious, and thus, claim 1 should be patentable over the cited art.

Claims 3-11 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1, and are not made obvious by the cited art for at least the same reasons as claim 1, and for the specific elements recited therein. Accordingly, claims 3-11 should be patentable over the cited art.

Additionally, regarding claim 3, Applicant's representative agrees that Burn does not teach or suggest that binding comprises a CMS checking for redundant tokens and revoking any such tokens, as recited in claim 3. However, the Examiner contends that Carlsson makes up for the deficiencies of Burn. In rejecting claim 3, the Examiner contends that Carlsson discloses revoking tokens of individuals when their role has changed in order to do away with redundant certificates (See Office Action Page 4). However, the Examiner has not cited (nor can Applicant's representative find) any part of Carlsson that discloses what the Examiner contends. The only part of Carlsson cited in the rejection of claim 3 is Carlsson's disclosure of its

certificate revocation procedure (See Office Action, Page 4, Citing Carlsson, Col. 9, lines 14-20). Carlsson discloses that a certificate can be revoked when a user has died, has been found to be unreliable or his/her role has changed (See Col. 9, Lines 14-17). However, the process cited in claim 3 ensures that a user possesses, at most, one token. Nothing in Carlsson teaches or suggests limiting the number of personalized cards that any one user can possess. Therefore, taken individually, or in combination, Burn and Carlsson fail to teach or suggest each and every element of claim 3.

Claim 11 recites a public key infrastructure system comprising a plurality of tokens, each token having a unique ID number stored therein, and a CMS facility including a first interface to read data from the plurality of tokens and to write data to the plurality of tokens and including a directory/database. Claim 11 also recites a badging facility including a terminal operatively connected to communicate with the CMS including a second interface to read data from the plurality of tokens and to write data to the plurality of tokens. Claim 11 also recites that the CMS generates a unique public/private key pair for each token and stores each token ID number and corresponding token public key in the directory/database and stores each token private key in its respective token. Claim 11 further recites that a Tokenizing Officer utilizes the terminal in badging facility to forward a unique ID number of the user to which a particular token is to be issued along with the unique ID number of the particular token to the CMS and wherein the CMS binds the unique ID number of the user to the particular token ID number by storing the correspondence there between in the directory/database, wherein the Tokenizing Officer comprises a person.

Neither Burn nor Carlsson teaches or suggests that a Tokenizing Officer utilizes a terminal in a badging facility to forward a unique ID number of the user to which a particular token is to be issued along with a unique ID number of the particular token to a CMS, wherein the Tokenizing Officer comprises a person, as recited in claim 11. As stated above with respect to claim 1, Burn does not teach or suggest a Tokenizing Officer. Additionally, as stated above with respect to claim 1, Carlsson discloses only that user information and a validity periods are required to create a certificate (See Carlsson, Col. 8, Lines 27-30). Carlsson does not teach or

suggest a Tokenizing Officer utilizing a terminal to forward a unique ID of a particular token to a CMS, as recited in claim 11. Therefore, taken individually or in combination Burn and Carlsson do not teach or suggest that that a Tokenizing Officer utilizes the terminal in the badging facility to forward a unique ID number of a user to which a particular token is to be issued along with a unique ID number of the particular token to a CMS and wherein the CMS binds the unique ID number of the user to the particular token ID number by storing the correspondence there between in a directory/database, wherein the Tokenizing Officer comprises a person, as recited in claim 11. Accordingly, Burn taken in view of Carlsson does not teach or suggest each and every element of claim 11. Thus, Burn taken in view of Carlsson does not make claim 11 obvious, and claim 11 should be patentable over the cited art.

Claims 12-20 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 12, and are not made obvious by the cited art for at least the same reasons as claim 12, and for the specific elements recited therein. Accordingly, claims 12-20 should be patentable over the cited art.

Additionally, claim 13 recites that a CMS checks for redundant tokens and revokes any such user tokens. In the system recited in claim 13, each user can possess, at most, one token. As stated above with respect to claim 3, nothing in Burn teaches or suggests that a user cannot possess more than one hardware token. Additionally, nothing in Carlsson teaches nor suggests that a user cannot possess more than one personalized card. Therefore, taken individually or in combination, Burn and Carlsson do not teach or suggest each and every element of claim 13.

For the reasons described above, claims 1 and 3-20 should be patentable over the cited art. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant's representative respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Applicant's representative respectfully requests reconsideration of this application and that the application be passed to issue.

Please charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment in the fees for this amendment to our Deposit Account No. 20-0090.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 7-6-06

  
Christopher P. Harris  
Registration No. 43,660

CUSTOMER No.: 26,294

TAROLLI, SUNDHEIM, COVELL, & TUMMINO L.L.P.  
1300 EAST NINTH STREET, SUITE 1700  
CLEVELAND, OHIO 44114  
Phone: (216) 621-2234  
Fax: (216) 621-4072